

Date: Sat, 27 Nov 93 04:30:20 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #491  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sat, 27 Nov 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 491

Today's Topics:

                    Japanese no-code on HF  
                    Use of HT for Marine & GMRS

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 24 Nov 1993 15:38:48 -0600  
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!  
gerald@cc.utexas.edu!emx.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Japanese no-code on HF  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) said:

> The "Japanese no-code HF" argument is in fact a red-herring, since the  
> current CB Radio service is very similar to the Japanese no-code HF  
> license. The only difference is that the Japanese call their  
> CB radio operators "amateurs" and license them, whereas we don't.

What are the privileges of the no-code HF licensees in Japan?  
I believe they are limited to 10 watts, but do they share the  
10m phone allocation with the coded JAs and thus with the rest  
of the world? Has anyone ever knowingly worked one of them?  
It's not clear to me from the above whether the "JA CB" license  
holders are the same as the "JA no-code HF" hams.

I believe there is an official 50-watt limit even for coded

JAs on 10m - in the ARRL DX contest where the exchange includes the power, all JAs send 599-50 on 10m, where they are just as loud as when they send 599-500 or whatever on 15m...

Would the people who would like HF access without code on the amateur bands be happy with a 10 watt limit? (if were enforced of course - just like the limit is enforced for CB, ha). When 10m is in great shape, 10 watts can work fine, but when it's not, 10 watts is the pits.

See you all in the CW contest this weekend,

Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)  
Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,  
Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)  
oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

-----  
Date: 24 Nov 1993 12:37:25 CST  
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!maccvm.corp.mot.com!CSLE87@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Use of HT for Marine & GMRS  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Mike - When John wrote about the Yaesu (actually Vertex in the US) unit he neglected to tell you that it is pre-programmed channels only, like ALL type-accepted units. According to Yaesu/Vertex's Technical Assistance crew at 1900Z today, the FTH-2070 is NOT type accepted for Part 95 GMRS and should not be represented as such by their dealers. It is OK only for Land Mobile and Maritime applications.

John made one other minor error in stating that land mobile includes GMRS. Actually the "Private Land Mobile Radio Services" are covered under Part 90, while GMRS and other "Personal Radio Services" are in Part 95. They require separate type acceptances, and "Maritime" is still a third separate acceptance with DIFFERENT technical specs under Part 80. It is definitely NOT as simple as some folks want to believe, but at least the Vertex folks know and tell the proper story if you call. KB

----- Original Article -----  
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy  
From: rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters)  
Subject: Re: Use of HT for Marine & GMRS  
Organization: Motorola IPD  
Date: Wed, 24 Nov 1993 09:03:37 -0700  
Message-ID: <rcrw90-241193090337@node\_13059.aieg.mot.com>  
Followup-To: rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc  
References: <93326.174137MGB@SLACVM.SLAC.STANFORD.EDU> <holland-231193103417@bea  
Sender: news@schbbs.mot.com (Net News)

Nntp-Posting-Host: 129.188.192.6  
Lines: 29

In article <1993Nov24.054951.28838@kd4nc.uucp>, n4tii@kd4nc.uucp (John Reed) wrote:

> rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:

> >Even so, I am unaware of any comercial radio being type accepted for more  
> >than one service such as GMRS and Marine, even if the only difference is  
> >the front panel!

> Check out the Yeasu FTH-2070...it's a commercial dual bander. It is marine  
> type accepted, as well as land mobile (which includes GMRS).

>

> It'll do ham, commerical, public safety, GMRS, and marine all in the box, and  
> legal to boot!

Hmmm, how do the get around the "user can't enter the frequency"  
requirement for the marine and fixed services?

The area in which I am most aware of this is HF, where many people use ham  
rigs illegally on marine channels because they would otherwise have to have  
two rigs on board. There are rigs advertised as doing both, but they don't  
allow programming of even the ham band frequencies from their sales  
literature, the channels are all pre-programmed for you.

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

BOBS BEST BENT WIRE SK

-----

Date: Wed, 24 Nov 1993 22:14:35 GMT  
From: news.uiowa.edu!icaen!drenze@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov22.212627.23285@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,  
<s9keDc3w165w@mystis.wariat.org>, <1993Nov24.192018.10920@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>  
Subject : Re: This is a hobby not a

jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>Not to mention the influx of the lawless, and those too damned lazy to earn  
>privileges instead of working for them.

\*chuckle\* -- sorry. I know it's mean. But read the second half of this statement as written, rather than as intended. It's rather funny.

Well, I for one know of a few rather young (high-school-age Wesley-Crusher types) getting into the amateur radio service who would not have done so otherwise with the intent of developing applications and new protocols for packet.

I have a ten-year-old sister working on earning her Tech license so when she gets into junior high school she'll be more easily able to work on a science project she's got in mind.

I know one or two high-schoolers who started out as Tech and are now working their way up to Extra-class and strongly thinking about EE as a career.

Seems to me that the Tech license is doing exactly what it's supposed to be doing--attract a high class of young person to the amateur radio service. As for attracting the "10-4 good buddy" crowd, I've been monitoring VHF for quite a bit longer than I've been on and I've also been monitoring HF. Know what? I've noticed no lids coming into the VHF bands from CB and elsewhere, but I've noticed quite a few lids with advanced and extra-class calls down in the 40 and 80 SSB ragchewing bands using language that embarrasses me to hear--and I work with cons and hear a lot of it. I've often wondered where the FCC is, where the pink-slips are, etc. Frankly, I'd rather talk to the no-coders than some of these lids any day.

And one more quick observation--notice how whenever you hear about people getting slapped down hard by the FCC for violations, they almost always seem to be high-class coders? Makes you wonder, eh?

73, doug

```
--
__ /|  | Doug Renze, N0YVW      |
\ 'o.o' | +1 319 337 4664      |   If you can read this you're too close.
=(___)= | drenze@icaen.uiowa.edu |
      U  | Douglas-Renze@uiowa.edu |
```

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #491

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*